

recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The parties were notified of their right to file objections (ECF No. 21 at 10). On July 3, 2014, the Commissioner filed her Reply to the Report (ECF No. 23), but only stated to rely on Defendant's previously filed memo. (ECF No. 19).

In the absence of objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough and careful review of the record, including the briefs from Plaintiff and the Commissioner, the magistrate judge's Report, and Commissioner's objections thereto, the court finds the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law in the instant case. The court **ADOPTS** the magistrate judge's Report [Dkt. No. 21] and incorporates it herein by reference. For the reasons set out in the Report, the Commissioner's final decision is **REVERSED** and **REMANDED** for further proceedings consistent with the magistrate judge's recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

J. Michelle Childs

United States District Judge

July 17, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina